

Appl. No. 10/783,797
Amdt. dated May 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 10, 2006

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4 were pending. Upon entry of this amendment, amending claims 1-2, and 4, canceling claim 3 without prejudice, and adding claims 5-21, claims 1-2, and 4-21 remain pending consideration. The drawings stand objected to as not showing the claimed subject matter. The abstract stands objected to as purporting the merits of the claimed subject matter. Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants aver that no new matter has been added in this response.

Examiner Interview

Applicants appreciate the interview with the Examiner on May 21, 2006, where the drawings objections were discussed in general. Based on the interview, Applicants believe that the Examiner no longer requires drawing amendments to overcome the objection as a method is described in the specification which is supported at least by Figure 2 and Figure 3. However, if drawing amendments are required, Applicants respectfully request acknowledgment thereof.

Objections to the Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to abstract. Applicants have amended the abstract to overcome the objection, and believe that the objection is now moot.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the use of trademarks such as RENDERMAN and XEON should be capitalized in the specification and accompanied by the generic terminology. Accordingly, the specification has been corrected and the trademarks have been capitalized and accompanied by the generic terminology (*e.g.*, RENDERMAN computer animation software, XEON microprocessor, *etc.*) Accordingly, the specification has been corrected and the trademarks have been capitalized in order to comply with MPEP §608.01(v).

Appl. No. 10/783,797
Amdt. dated May 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 10, 2006

PATENT

Objections to the Claims

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 2 and 4 for informalities. Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter and believe that the objections are now moot.

§ 112 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter in view of the Examiner's recommendations and believe that the rejections are now moot.

§ 101 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have canceled claim 3 without prejudice and submit that the rejection is now moot.

Allowable subject matter

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 1, 2, and 4 would be allowable if the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph are overcome.

Additional Claims

New claims 5-21 are supported in at least Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 4, and paragraphs 0025-0082, in the specification as filed.

Appl. No. 10/783,797
Amdt. dated May 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 10, 2006

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,



C. Bart Sullivan
Reg. No. 41,516

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
CBS:rgy
60783236 v1